

Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice –
2010 – Volume 19, Issue 3, pp. 6–20
URN:NBN:NL:UI:10-1-100960

ISSN: 1876-8830

URL: <http://www.journalsi.org>

Publisher: Igitur, Utrecht Publishing & Archiving
Services in cooperation with Utrecht University of
Applied Sciences, Faculty of Society and Law

Copyright: this work has been published under a
Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No
Derivative Works 3.0 Netherlands License

All authors work at CESRT Research Centre on
Social Integration at Zuyd University of Applied
Sciences. Correspondence to: CESRT, P.O. Box 634,
6200 AP, Maastricht, 0031 43 346 6642.

E-mail: m.potting@hszuyd.nl, m.sniekers@hszuyd.nl,
c.t.j.lamers@hszuyd.nl, a.reverda@hszuyd.nl

Received: 4 May 2010

Accepted: 15 June 2010

Review Category: Research

MARIANNE
POTTING, MARIJKE
SNEIERS,
CAROLINE LAMERS,
NOL REVERDA

LEGITIMIZING SOCIAL WORK: THE PRACTICE OF REFLECTIVE PROFESSIONALS

ABSTRACT

Legitimizing social work: the practice of reflective professionals

Social work is a profession that is very much part of and contributes to an ever changing and evolving society. It is therefore essential that social work is able to respond to the diverse and dynamic demands that it may encounter in that society and in the future. The critique of social work is, however, present and growing. The profession can no longer deny or ignore the need to legitimize its value and effectiveness. In this article, a research project – entitled Procivi – aimed at developing a method of legitimizing social work is presented. The method developed in Procivi proposes a way of legitimizing social work through the development of reflective professionals. The method teaches professionals to take a research frame of mind towards their own practice and helps them develop a vocabulary to describe their work to different audiences. The paper discusses whether and how this method forms a viable way of legitimizing social work and as such could be an alternative for the growing demand for social work based on scientific evidence (evidence-based practice, EBP).

Keywords

Social work, community work, professionalization, legitimization, evidence-based practice, reflective practice, reflective practitioner

SAMENVATTING

De legitimatie van welzijnswerk: De praktijk van reflectieve professionals

Welzijnswerk is een professie die een belangrijke bijdrage levert aan en onderdeel uitmaakt van een steeds veranderende maatschappij. Het is daarom van groot belang dat het welzijnswerk in staat is om zich aan te passen aan de diversiteit van vragen en de dynamiek in behoeften die in de maatschappij voortdurend ontstaan. De laatste jaren is de kritiek op het welzijnswerk echter alleen maar toegenomen. De beroepsgroep kan de eis om haar bestaansrecht en toegevoegde waarde te legitimeren niet meer ontkennen of negeren. In dit artikel stellen wij een onderzoeksproject – Procivi – aan u voor dat erop gericht was samen met professionals een methodiek te ontwikkelen die bij kan dragen aan deze legitimatie van de waarde van het welzijnswerk. De methodiek gaat daarbij uit van de ontwikkeling van reflectieve professionals. De methodiek ondersteunt professionals bij het ontwikkelen van een onderzoeksattitude ten opzichte van hun eigen werk en hun functioneren en het helpt hen bij het ontwikkelen van een professioneel vocabulaire. Besproken wordt of de methode Procivi een bijdrage kan leveren aan de legitimatie van het welzijnswerk, en als zodanig een alternatief kan vormen voor de toenemende vraag naar welzijnswerk dat gebaseerd is op wetenschappelijke bewijzen (evidence-based practice, EBP).

Trefwoorden

Welzijnswerk, social work, opbouwwerk, professionalisering, legitimatie, evidence-based practice, reflectieve praktijken, reflective practitioner

INTRODUCTION

Social work has a long tradition that is historically grounded in charity work. Nowadays, social work is considered a profession that requires an educational background, an organizational context and a political mandate. Social work has become an intrinsic part of our social welfare systems. But social work is not without its critics either. Time and again, social work professionals are asked to legitimize their activities, to show the effects of their actions and the changes they are

meant to bring about in society. Demands like this have resulted in a debate on legitimacy and the ways social work can or should legitimize its value to society (Spierts, 2005; Dozy, 2008; Tonkens, 2008a).

Social work is, in many ways, invisible work. The goal of social work in general, and community work in particular, is to support the autonomy of vulnerable citizens, to be an advocate for the powerless and to help integrate outsiders into mainstream society. Social workers are the executioners of political and policy decisions, but are also expected to be on the frontline, preventing and combating social problems. They should be able to speak the language of managers and politicians, but must also be streetwise.

The main goal of social work is to help people and communities to become self-reliant and integrated into the quality of life of society. The better social workers do their job, the more they should become superfluous. Social work is carried out in the social world of everyday people, it is part of the community and an element of the civil society. Social work supports people in their everyday lives and is inherently contextual (Reverda, 2005). Social work will always be just one factor among the many that determine the social position (or lack of) of an individual. Moreover, the effects of the intervention of social work are often intended to be long-term effects and may therefore be invisible in the short term. This makes it hard to "prove" the contribution that social work has had in the lives of vulnerable people (Steyaert & Van den Biggelaar, 2008).

Yet at the same time, the demands for social work to prove its usefulness are becoming louder. Client organizations, political leaders and commissioners want social work professionals to explain what they are doing, why and how they do it, and how that is going to solve an identified social problem. At a time of dwindling funding, the retrenchment of governments and neo-liberal arguments for personal responsibility and market competition, social work is faced with ever-growing numbers of critics who question the value of social work and the professionalism of social workers (Tonkens, 2008b; Jansen, Brink & Kole, 2009). In order to satisfy those critics, the field of social work needs to take a critical look at itself: is social work really doing the best job it can? Do professionals really help people to become independent? Are its goals, means and objectives transparent? Does it provide insight into its results and achievements convincingly?

For any profession, it is desirable and productive to have an internal discussion about what improvements should be made, rather than simply being the subject of criticism from outside. It is important that social workers themselves participate actively in this debate and come up with new ways to find, present and improve their professional identity and their value to society. So how can social workers represent their profession in this debate?

In this article, we will contribute to the debate on the legitimacy of social work on the basis of the results from the research project Procivi.¹ Procivi is a research project started with the intention of

applying evidence-based practice (EBP) in a study of the methods used by community workers. The way in which the project developed in practice leads us to advocate reflection as a means of legitimizing social work.²

Many critics of social work view evidence-based practice (EBP) as a golden standard that can be used to prove the value and effectiveness of social work. They claim that objective study of the effects and results of social work will be the means of validating their work. On the other side of the legitimacy debate are those who do not believe that the medically oriented method of EBP is possible or even desirable in a contextual and social field like social work (Reverda, 2005). They are looking at alternatives such as reflective practice as a way to “prove” the value of social work (Steyaert & Van den Biggelaar, 2008).

Evidence-based practice has become a standard in the medical field for some time now. Decision making about medical (and nursing) interventions is increasingly based on the natural scientific proof of their effectiveness. Experimental set-ups, randomized control trials and large-scale literature reviews (Balkon, 2004; Schoemaker, 2005; Jong, 2008) are now considered not only useful but also necessary in order to evaluate the appropriateness of a medical intervention. Theoretically and ideally, EBP would take three determining factors for a successful outcome into account: the methodology or treatment used, the practitioner and the client/patient. However, in practice, EBP is often reduced to studying the effectiveness of the method alone. There are even those who advocate leaving out the “personal element” of EBP altogether in order to ensure its objective quality. Although there is growing criticism about the validity of this “scientific proof”, even in the medical field (Gageldonk, 2007), EBP as a method of evaluating interventions has become the standard for legitimization and quality control in medicine.

As the critical discussion of the effectiveness of social work has increased and the demands for legitimization of social work interventions have grown louder, practitioners and scientists alike have looked to EBP as a way to “prove” the value of social work (Reverda & Richardson, 2001). Nowadays in social domains, not working according to EBP guidelines is increasingly viewed as a less professional way of working (Steyaert & Van den Biggelaar, 2008). Evidence-based practice in a modified form could become a tool for social work to silence the critics and re-establish its position in the social domain as an essential part of the support of groups in need.

However, there are three important reasons why EBP, in its narrow intervention-oriented approach, may not be the answer to the legitimacy issues surrounding social work. The first reason concerns theoretical and methodological issues. Ideally, EBP relies on “experimental” research of interventions to determine which intervention is the most effective. In the social field, this is problematic. Social interventions can generally not be studied outside their natural context and, even if that were possible, those results would not be good indicators of effectiveness in

the real social world. Determining the sole factors that contribute to the success or failure of a social intervention is practically impossible and it is therefore also impossible to “claim” any result as proof of the effectiveness of social work. Moreover, EBP always focuses on the “method”, the “intervention” as the agent of change; in social work, however, it is usually impossible to distinguish between the “objectivity” of the intervention on the one hand and the impact of the personal qualities of the professional social worker on the other. The same method can be used and perceived differently when applied by different social workers.

A second issue that is raised when legitimizing social work through EBP is political in nature and concerns issues of professional autonomy and the balance between the different roles of a social worker. EBP as a way of legitimizing a profession focuses on quantitative accountability, it requires the translation of goals, methods and results in quantifiable outcomes and measures. Social work as a profession needs to take a position in the legitimacy debate and this needs to be done in a dialogue on control and autonomy, in which qualitative accountability should prevail over quantitative accountability (Tonkens, 2008b). Techniques and methods in social work should not prevail over interpersonal relationships. The core of social work is the ability to act in a way that is “streetwise” rather than in a standardized manner (Dozy, 2008).

The third issue that needs to be addressed is of a practical nature and concerns the methodological requirements of effect evaluation. In order to be able to research effects and outcomes, you need to have a clearly defined starting point: what was the situation before the social intervention was implemented? In many cases, however, social work jumps in midway and often in situations that need immediate attention. Moreover, it is not only your starting point that needs to be set in advance, but also your desired goals and outcomes. To assess whether a specific target has been met, the target itself needs to be clear and measurable. If you do not know where you are starting and you do not know where you are supposed to go, it is impossible to know whether you are on the right track no matter how good your measurements might be.

The research project Procivi, described in this article, focused mainly on this third issue. Recent Dutch projects like the TRILL³ project and Movisie’s professionalization project (http://www.movisie.nl/120393/def/home/effectieve_interventies_in_de_sociale_sector/; Vlaar, 2009)⁴ illustrate that social work still struggles with basic questions about setting goals, defining methods and identifying results. It seems unlikely therefore that social work as a field is ready for a strict method of accountability like EBP. That means that social work will have to find other ways of proving its legitimacy and answering questions about its effectiveness. We propose developing a practice of a reflective professional as a viable alternative.

PROCIVI: A PRACTICE-BASED RESEARCH PROJECT ON SOCIAL WORK

Procivi was a project where social researchers and social practitioners joined forces to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the social profession and find ways to clarify and legitimize what social professionals do in practice. Procivi's goals, for researchers and practitioners alike, were to jointly explain and evaluate working practices in the domain of social welfare, to jointly develop a method to systematically describe and document these working practices, to disseminate the results and insights to the social workers, educators, policy makers and other stakeholders and implement results in social work practice, education and training (Sniekers, Dinjens, Lamers, Potting & Reverda, 2009a). Originally, Procivi's main focus was on the methods used by social workers and its goal was to scientifically "prove" the value of these methods. The first phase of the research project aimed at describing the projects and methods used and establishing a "base line" of effectiveness. The intention was to repeat those measurements later in the project and see whether and how the projects had become "more effective".

However, the preliminary results of Procivi led to a change in the research project. It became clear early on that it was difficult for professionals to describe and clarify their goals, the methods they chose and the results they realized. It became apparent to all parties that establishing a baseline was impossible and that conducting a proper effect evaluation was too ambitious a goal. The focus in the research project therefore shifted from an emphasis on the projects and their outcomes to the professionals and their way of working. The questions became: what makes a social worker a good professional? Which words describe the intuitive work of social professionals? How can invisible social work be made visible? If social work cannot yet be measured, how can social workers legitimize their contribution to the solution of social problems? The research project became a joint effort to find the words to describe the practice of social work and critically assess the current state of the profession and the professionals who work there.

Procivi became a research project where researchers and professionals came together to explore the professionalization of social work practice and developed instruments to aid in this professionalization. Critical reflection and reflexivity became the main concepts of the project. As such, the Procivi project is in line with recent international discussions on critical reflection in social work. For examples of the international discussion on critical reflection, we refer to the special issue of the *European Journal of Social Work* (*European Journal of Social Work*, 2009), or the work of Fook, White & Gardner (2006) and D'Cruz, Gillingham & Melendez (2007). Procivi took these discussions as a starting point and developed its own method of working on critical reflection and reflective practice with professionals in the field.

LEGITIMIZING SOCIAL WORK: THE PRACTICE OF REFLECTIVE PROFESSIONALS

The professionalization and reflection process in Procivi can be divided into two concepts; the reflective practitioner and the communicative practitioner. Reflection in Procivi is identified as the development from an intuitive social worker who makes working decisions based on tacit knowledge into a reflective practitioner working with explicit knowledge (Schön, 1991). Communication is identified as the ability to find words to describe the practice of daily work, its goals, strategies and results, as well as being able to use different vocabularies to explain these to different stakeholders, such as target groups, policy makers, managers and politicians (e.g. multiple accountability (Hupe, 2009)).

METHODOLOGY

The Procivi research project can be described as a "research in action" study. A range of qualitative research methods was used in the study: written questionnaires with open questions and in-depth, semi-structured interviews to gain detailed knowledge of the professionals and their working practices. Focus group meetings to develop a language for social work and give words to the social practices and expert meetings to learn from and discuss with theoretical and practical specialists. These methods contributed mainly to the development of the communicative practitioner who is able to describe his work using the various vocabularies suited to his various audiences.

The development of the reflective practitioner needed an additional set of research instruments. These included focus group meetings which were used to research practitioners' own work practices and those of others, and supervision meetings where supervision techniques were used to reflect on the working practice and professional identity. Additionally, "mirror" meetings with outside professionals, commissioners, students and clients were organized to challenge and evoke different ideas. Furthermore, an interactive discussion document was generated in which the professional identity was described by the professionals themselves (Sniekers *et al.*, 2009a).

Sixteen professionals from two welfare organizations together with five researchers from a research institute formed the core project team for Procivi for two years. A broad range of different social work methodologies was represented among the professionals in the project. As such, the participating group of professionals was a good representation of social work and welfare in the Netherlands. All the professionals were interviewed by the researchers extensively by means of semi-structured questionnaires. The data gathered from the interviews was triangulated with written material from the organizations, descriptions of their work practice from the professionals and information gathered in the group discussions. Throughout the research project, the collected

data was presented to the professionals for feedback and further clarification and was then used to determine the next steps in the research project jointly. An expert was added to the team to lead the supervision meetings.

Students of social work were involved in the project in two ways. First there was a "mirror meeting" at which circa 300 students met 20 professionals in group sessions. In these sessions, professionals explained to students how social work was conducted in practice, while students asked professionals questions about their work, questions that were often self-evident to the professionals. The second way that the students participated in the project was more intense. A group of six students worked intensively on developing a reflection instrument for students that they could use in their internships.

Procivi was a project that incorporated many different research techniques. Although a general framework was used to monitor the progress of the project, many of the individual research methods were selected on the basis of recent progress in the project, current questions and "next step" plans. The general framework made sure that the final outcomes of the project had value for both the researchers and the practitioners. Those outcomes consisted mainly of a set of practical instruments that could be used to further develop and maintain a process of professionalization in practice.

Throughout the project, social workers, researchers and social work students jointly developed four products for social workers. The products consisted of two reflection instruments for social professionals (Lamers, Dinjens, Potting, Sniekers, Engelen & Reverda, 2009a; Lamers, Engelen, Dinjens, Potting, Sniekers & Reverda, 2009b). These reflection instruments – a detailed and extensive one and a smaller more condensed one – guide the practitioner by way of a list of detailed questions through an extensive and reflexive analysis of his or her working practices. Emphasis is put on the exploratory stages of – and factors involved in – professional decision making, such as local social issues, goal setting, target group, methods used, results achieved and so on. The underlying goals are not only to become conscious of how these factors (should) interact, but also to evaluate, communicate and justify the professional decisions made as well as the results achieved.

Students of social work also worked on a reflection instrument. Their instrument is designed primarily to be a tool for use during their internships to help them reflect on their on-the-job training to become social work practitioners (Sniekers, Dinjens, Lamers, Potting & Reverda, 2009b). The final instrument of Procivi is a tool that describes how the Procivi project worked and how it can be implemented by other agencies and groups that seek a similar process of professionalization. This instrument benefits from the learning experience Procivi was and incorporates all the lessons learned by all the participants about an action research on professionalization such as this (Potting, Sniekers, Lamers, Dinjens & Reverda, 2009).

RESULTS

Reflective vocabulary

When analysing the way in which the practitioners that participated in Procivi described their working practices, a number of observations stand out. All the professionals in the project were capable, enthusiastic and well-educated professionals, yet their descriptions of their daily work practices and the logic behind their actions were often vague, lacking in purpose, abstract and unclear.

Professionals could easily and passionately describe *what* they did but had great difficulty in describing *why*, *how* and with *which result* they did it.

Professionals operated on the basis of practice-based knowledge led by experience; as such, their practices become self-evident after a while. Analytical questions such as “why did you approach that person in that way at that time?”, or “how did you know that that particular method would work with that group?” were typically answered along the lines of “I don’t know, I always do it like that” or “I just knew that would be the right way to do it”.

Although reflection was considered an important part of the professionalism of most participating social workers, they lacked the skill or professional vocabulary to reflect on their work. The descriptions they gave of their daily work practice were riddled with phrases like “always”, “just because”, “common”, “routine” or “self-evident”. This proved that the professionals were capable of deciding their course of action based on experience and knowledge of what worked and that they did not need to deliberate over every single action they performed – a characteristic of experienced professional practice. The capacity to take a step back and actively reflect on their own working practice, however, was lost in most cases.

Goal setting

In order for a professional to be able to reflect on their working practices and whether he or she is attaining the results and goals that they are striving for, it is absolutely necessary to set clear goals and targets. This, however, proved to be a problem.

In the interviews and focus group meetings, professionals stated that they were often “let loose” in neighbourhoods or communities with no clearly defined goals. A typical assignment might be “to strengthen civil society”, “to enhance social cohesion” or “to support the self-efficacy of a client”. It is no surprise that with vague and rather unattainable goals like those, professionals were unable to ascertain whether they were successful in reaching these goals.

The grounds for the choice of target groups, designated neighbourhoods or social problems that the professionals were supposed to support and help was often unclear to professionals in the field. Policy concerns, modern trends and funding issues often lay at the core of these choices making it difficult to understand the social problem being targeted and the context in which it was being presented. Moreover, since the social problem that had to be solved had often not been the subject of any prior investigation or research, there was often no foundation on which to base the choice for a specific intervention methodology. Professionals were given broad, vague goals, but at the same time were unable to translate those goals into workable targets themselves either.

Choosing methods

The result was often that the method became the goal. Realizing a community centre in itself became the goal, rather than being the means to an end. Furthermore the choice for a specific methodology was often rather arbitrary and not based on a proper analysis of the situation. Instead the method could be chosen based on availability ("There was this unused space in the neighbourhood, so we started an activity centre"), prior experience ("The method worked well in one neighbourhood so now it was to be implemented in other neighbourhoods as well"), or historical precedent ("We have organized this group activity every year for twenty years now"). In many cases, professionals were unable to identify a specific "method" at all, they described their work in terms of activities without a methodological logic, even if there seemed to be a method behind their work.

Measuring results

Although the dogma of the SMART⁵ formulation of objectives and targets is frequently heard in the field of social work, in practice it does not always result in clear goals and well-defined projects. Not only is it almost impossible to know if and whether results are being attained when objectives are unclear, it is also impossible to measure them. According to the professionals in Procivi, the need for legitimization in social work has led to an ever-growing mountain of paperwork that is meant to monitor and measure social work in practice. At the same time, these numbers are often useless if one wants to answer questions about results and achievements. Statistics about the number of organized activities, the number of participants and the contentment of those participants have their uses, but they do not answer questions about the "number of people reached relative to the target population", "the reason why people do or do not participate in activities", "whether the life of a satisfied social services client actually has improved".

DISCUSSION

The need to legitimize the value of social work in the current political and social climate continues to grow. Evidence-based practice is a popular way to scientifically prove the methodological bases for social or medical intervention. EBP, however, requires clear and undisputed goals, clear descriptions of the methods used and a way of measuring and evaluating the outcomes of the interventions used. Social work practice at this stage is not able to meet those requirements.

Where does that leave social work and its need to legitimize its contribution to civil society and its wish to silence its critics?

What Procivi has shown is that the main body of professional knowledge of social workers is implicitly present. Their professional actions are based on tacit knowledge, knowledge that they are no longer aware of and that has been incorporated and become invisible. Tacit knowledge is knowledge based on routines that have become so self-evident that they are no longer perceived as learned information. Tacit knowledge is important for working professionally because it means that appropriate actions can be taken quickly and adequately without the need for long reflection. But if tacit knowledge remains tacit, it cannot be reflected upon, questioned or transferred to starting professionals. As part of the ongoing process of professionalization, it is necessary to make tacit knowledge explicit knowledge again.

This means that it is necessary to focus on awareness and strengthening the approach and capacity to explain practices, interventions and actions of social work practitioners. It also means that practitioners need help to find the words and vocabulary to voice and legitimize these practices and their presumptions in different social cultural, economical, administrative and political domains. They have to be able to voice and account for their streetwise knowledge and approach (Dozy, 2008). We therefore propose a systematic reflection in and on the work practice as an alternative way of legitimizing social work. Teaching professionals how to approach their work as an academic approaches research, constantly critically assessing their decision-making processes, what they are doing and why, and providing practitioners with a professional vocabulary in which to express their findings will result in a transparent and legitimate practice (Petr & Walter, 2009).

Procivi developed a method to aid the transformation of social workers into reflective practitioners. As stated, most social workers act on intuition when deciding how to approach a social problem (Sniekers *et al.*, 2009a). This tacit knowledge is implicit in their everyday actions and patterns, and is spontaneous and intuitive (Schön, 1991). Following Schön, this was identified as "intuition in action" in Procivi. Schön (1991) explains action and reflection in a process that starts as knowing-in-action via reflection-on-action to reflection-in-action. This process results in a social practitioner

who develops into a reflective practitioner. The method and instruments that were developed during the Procivi project are very well suited for use in other social work organizations to aid them in their process of internal professionalization and help them to develop the reflective frame needed of mind and the appropriate vocabulary. The professionals, field methods and social work organizations that participated in Procivi are representative of social work in the Netherlands in general. The "method Procivi" as described in the methods book (Potting *et al.*, 2009) is transferable to other organizations and new projects on professionalization in social work. Reflective practice, however, will require commitment from both professionals as well as the organizations they work in. Professionals clearly stated that they missed the opportunity for reflection and collegial supervision in their organizations. They felt their work would improve and be more rewarding if they received more help to professionalize. Practices of intervision and supervision have disappeared from the welfare organizations and professionalization budgets are typically left unused. Nowadays a research frame of mind is largely absent from the social field (Lynch, Zhang & Korr, 2009). The professionals, the organizations and the sector as a whole hardly invest in the thorough study of the social problems that they are supposed to be solving, the methods they intend to use, the objectives they should be able to attain and the results they achieve in practice. In a field where proper process evaluation is still in its infancy, effect evaluation still seems to be a step too far. Welfare organizations and professionals alike will have to be willing to invest in processes of professionalization in order to be able to take a stronger position in the legitimacy debate in the future. The reflection and critical stance that is necessary for it are greatly supported with an institutionalized practice of intervision and supervision. When professionals are encouraged and facilitated to have an open discussion of their good and bad practices, their questions and dilemmas with colleagues, and when professionals use this opportunity to learn and voice their experiences, the result will be a practice of "reflection on action". Social work professionals, managers and policy makers will be better equipped to explain what they do, how, why, and what results are to be expected. A reflective and communicative practice is the first and most important step toward legitimization. Sharing experiences and understanding with peers can ultimately provide the necessary practice-based evidence in social work, bringing it one step closer to demonstrating the value of social work intervention.

CONCLUSION

The key outcomes of Procivi can be captured by four terms: legitimization, communication, research and reflection. Although social work is increasingly being required to legitimize its work and achievements, it became very clear during the project of Procivi that the practice of social work

LEGITIMIZING SOCIAL WORK: THE PRACTICE OF REFLECTIVE PROFESSIONALS

still needs substantial further development before it can even begin to "measure" its work and its results systematically.

Social work can no longer ignore questions about its legitimacy and value. Social work and social work professionals will need to find their own way to legitimize their work and demonstrate the need for social work to the world.

Procivi has provided ample evidence of the things that need to be improved in social work, it has also shown how this can be achieved: any legitimization of social work will have to start with the professional and his or her capacity to look critically, systematically and with a research perspective at his own work practice. Without reflection by the social worker on his own work and position in the social field, any research directed at proving the effectiveness of social work will be impossible.

Procivi has shown the alternative way of constructing a body of knowledge and skills; a method that fits well into the social domain. This method is working from within the social work domain and has been developed with social professionals, rather than being taken from a different field of work or imposed from outside. This provides social workers with the option of taking their own professional responsibility and engaging in a professional dialogue with all stakeholders in the social domain.

NOTE

- 1 The name Procivi meaning "For Citizens" emphasizes the focus of the project on welfare support in civil society.
- 2 Social work in the Netherlands can be divided in different domains and areas of work. Generally speaking, these domains and areas are social care work, social pedagogical work and community work. The social workers of the Procivi project are working in the domain of community work as community workers, youth workers, volunteer coaches, home care coaches, senior citizen advisors or neighbourhood workers.
- 3 TRILL means Transparante Resultaatgerichte Informatievoorziening Lokaal en Landelijk (Local and National Transparent Results-oriented Information Service) and it is aimed at helping welfare organizations make their results measurable and visible (Servicepunt Welzijnsinformatie (2009), <http://www.servicepuntwelzijnsinformatie.nl/actueel.aspx?id=2298>).
- 4 Movisie is currently carrying out projects and organizing conferences aimed at increasing and ensuring the competences of professionals in setting goals, measuring effects and being accountable for their interventions (Vlaar, 2009; http://www.movisie.nl/120393/def/home/effectieve_interventies_in_de_sociale_sector/).
- 5 Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic Time.

REFERENCES

- Balkon, A. van (2004). Naar evidence based diagnostiek in de psychiatrie [Towards evidence based diagnostics in psychiatry]. *Maandblad Geestelijke Volksgezondheid*, 59, 610–617.
- D’Cruz, H., Gillingham, P., & Melendez, S. (2007). Reflexivity, its meanings and relevance for social work: a critical review of the literature. *British Journal of Social Work Online*, 37(1), 73–90.
- Dozy, M. (2008). *Het is altijd het beroep van de toekomst geweest: De beroepsontwikkeling van het opbouwwerk* [It always was the profession of the future. De professionalisation of community work]. Zutphen: Walburg Pers.
- European Journal of Social Work (2009). Special issue: critical reflection in social work. *European Journal of Social Work*, 12, 287–398.
- Fook, J., White, S., & Gardner, F. (Eds.) (2006). *Critical reflection in health and social care*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gageldonk, A. van (2007). Voorbij de evidentie [Beyond the evidence]. *Maandblad Geestelijke Volksgezondheid*, 658–660.
- Hupe, P. (2009). De autonomie van de vakman (m/v): Over de regeldruk en handelingsruimte [The autonomy of the professional (m/f): on regulatory pressure and manoeuvring space] (pp. 129–149). In T. Jansen, G. van den Brink & J. Kole (Eds.), *Beroepstrots. Een ongekende kracht*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Jansen, T., Brink, G. van den, & Kole, J. (Eds.) (2009). *Beroepstrots. Een ongekende kracht* [Professional pride. An unknown force]. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Jong, C. D. (2008). *Evidence-based mental health: toetssteen of leermethode in verslavingszorg?* [Evidence-based mental health: touchstone or learning method in addiction treatment?]. *Verslaving*, 4(2), 67–69.
- Lamers, C., Dinjens, J., Potting, M., Sniekers, M., Engelen, E. van, & Reverda, N. (2009a). *Professionalisering van de welzijnswerker: Zelfreflectie als instrument. De Procivi Quick Scan*. [Professionalisation of the social worker: self reflection as an instrument. The Procivi Quick Scan]. Maastricht: CESRT, Hogeschool Zuyd.
- Lamers, C., Engelen, E. van, Dinjens, J., Potting, M., Sniekers, M., & Reverda, N. (2009b). *Professionalisering van de welzijnswerker: Zelfreflectie als instrument* [Professionalisation of The social worker: Self reflection as an instrument]. Maastricht: Cesrt, Hogeschool Zuyd.
- Lynch, M., Zhang, L., & Korr, W. (2009). Research training, institutional support, and self-efficacy: Their impact on research activity of social workers. *Advances in Social Work*, 10(2), 193–210.

- Petr, C. G., & Walter, U. M. (2009). Evidence-based practice: a critical reflection. *European Journal of Social Work*, 12(2), 221–232.
- Potting, M., Sniekers, M., Lamers, C., Dinjens, J., & Reverda, N. (2009). *Professionalisering van de welzijnswerker: Een Methodieboek* [Professionalisation of the social worker. A methods book]. Maastricht: Cesrt, Hogeschool Zuyd, Maastricht.
- Reverda, N. (2005). *Social work research in a comparative and European context*. Maastricht: CESRT/Hogeschool Zuyd.
- Reverda, N., & Richardson, J. (2001). Watching the detectives; reflections on research. *Social Work in Europe*, 7(3), 1–7.
- Schoemaker, C. (2005). Als 't maar werkt [As long as it works]. *Maandblad Geestelijke Gezondheid*, 60, 889–890.
- Schön, D. (1991). *The reflective practitioner. How professionals think in action*. Great Britain, Aldershot: Ashgate Arena.
- Sniekers, M., Dinjens, J., Lamers, C., Potting, M., & Reverda, N. (2009a). *Professionalisering van de welzijnswerker. Een terugblik op twee jaar Procivi* [Professionalisation of the social worker. Looking back at two years of Procivi]. Maastricht: CESRT, Hogeschool Zuyd.
- Sniekers, M., Dinjens, J., Lamers, C., Potting, M., & Reverda, N. (2009b). *Professionalisering van de welzijnswerker: Diamant reflectie: een reflectie-instrument voor praktijkleren door en voor studenten* [Professionalisation of the social worker: Diamant reflection, a reflection instrument for in service training by and for students]. Maastricht: CESRT, Hogeschool Zuyd.
- Spierts, M. (2005). Een 'derde weg' voor de sociaal-culturele professies [A 'third route' for the social cultural professions]. In G. van den Brink, T. Jansen & D. Pessers (Eds.), *Beroepszeer. Waarom Nederland niet goed werkt* (pp. 234–248) [Professional ache. Why the Netherlands doesn't work properly]. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Steyaert, J., & Biggelaar, T. van den (2008). Meervoudige verantwoording: Hulp aan huis effectief [Multiple accountability: Home help effective]. *Maatwerk*, 9(6), 25–27.
- Tonkens, E. (2008a). Herwaardering voor professionals, maar hoe? [Reappreciation for professionals, but how?]. In *Raad voor Openbaar Bestuur Lezingen 9 september 2008*, Den Haag.
- Tonkens, E. (2008b). *Mondige burgers, getemde professionals. Marktwerking en professionaliteit in de publieke sector* [Vocal citizens, subdued professionals. Market incentives, demand management and professionalism in the public sector]. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.
- Vlaar, P. (2009). Professionalisering Welzijnswerk [Professionalisation of Social Work]. In *Procivi Slotconferentie: Maken we onze professionaliteit waar* [Procivi Conference: Do we live up to our professionalism]. Maastricht: CESRT Research Centre Social Integration, Hogeschool Zuyd.